## **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Patent Office for withdrawing the objections to the claims, drawings, and Specification.

Claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, and 7 have been amended. No new matter is added.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lu et al. (hereinafter Lu) (US 5,99,813) in view of Chawla et al. (hereinafter Chawla) (US 6,771,661 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-9 for the reasons discussed below.

The Patent Office has conceded that Lu fails to disclose having the feature said base station comprising means for indicating to said corporate terminals the amount of resources they are allocated, but the Patent Office has asserted that such a feature is taught in Chawla.

The Patent Office has asserted that the Chawla discloses the feature "said base station comprises means for indicating to said voice, facsimile, computer terminal (210, 211, 212) which reads on the claimed 'corporate radio terminals' the amount of bandwidth which reads on the claimed 'resources' they are allocated (see col. 10, line 65-col. 11, line 34; col. 11, lines 55-62; col 12, lines 6-25; Figs. 3-5), where the data communications device (201-1, e.g., PBX) provides bandwidth to the terminals (210) of the communication network (200) in which the base station and means would be inherent for communicating over a wireless transmission link." (Office Action, page 4).

Applicant submits that the combination of Lu and Chawla fails to teach or suggest at least a base station continuously indicating to the corporate radio terminals the amount of resources they are allocated. First, there is no base station in Chawla indicating the amount of allocated resources to terminals (210-212). Second, the alleged device 201 (PBX) allocates the amount of bandwidth itself, based on bandwidth allocation information, so the device 201 does not (and has no need to) indicate the amount of allocated resources to the terminals (210-212). That is, the device 201 (PBX) is for controlling the bandwidth allocation, and in fact, Chawla has no disclosure suggesting that the device 201 (PBX) does anything more.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that device 201 (PBX) were to indicate the amount of allocated resources to terminals 210-212, as asserted by the Patent Office, Chawla does not teach or suggest a base station that continuously indicates the amount of allocated resources. The bandwidth allocation information used by the device 201 (PBX) is only able to (1) change the bandwidth during a session and (2) update the bandwidth allocation based upon a specific occurrence (e.g., event or time) without having to send a separate bandwidth allocation message to the device 201 (PBX). The same is described in Chawla as dynamically and automatically updating the allocated bandwidth. Therefore, even if/the bandwidth is dynamically and automatically updated, Chawla still fails to teach or suggest at least (1) indicating to the terminals the amount of allocated resources, and *a fortiori*, (2) continuously indicating to the terminals the amount of allocated resources.

The Patent Office has mistakenly presupposed that controlling allocated resources and indicating allocated resources as the same limitation, recited in claim 1. However, these

Attorney Docket No. Q68486

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

U.S. Application No. 10/084,432

limitations are not redundant and both should be given patentable weight. Thus, at least based on

the foregoing reasons, the combination fails to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in

independent claims 1, 2, and 7, along with dependent claims 3-6, 8, and 9. Applicant

respectfully requests the Patent Office to reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of the

claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 45,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 22, 2005

7